4/

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,301	12/12/2001	Matthias Stefan Bierbrauer	DE920000115US1	5600

7590   02/25/2005

Gregory M. Doudnikoff
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All , b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed on December 12, 2001. No

preliminary amendments to the specification were filed. Claims 1 – 7 are currently being

considered.

Specification

2.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the line "The present

invention to provides ..." is not meaningful. Please delete "to".

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1- 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,810,404).

4.   Regarding Claim 1, Ferguson teaches and describes a method for processing

documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are

executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4

line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), said method comprising the steps

of:

providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process (Column

3 lines 47 – 59, Column 17 lines 12 – 20 and 59 – 67); and

invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a

document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process

(Column 3 line 60 – Column 4 line 35).

5.   Regarding Claim 6, Ferguson teaches and describes a method for executing an

agent comprising customized code relative to documents being archived from a

document processing system (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35

and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), said method comprising the steps of :

selecting a document resident in the document processing system for archiving

(Column 14 lines 58 – 65 and Column 17 lines 21 – 25) ;

creating an archiving request for the selected document to an archiving engine

associated with the document processing system (Column 17 lines 21 – 33);

invoking a pre-archiving agent, if any, on the selected document (Column 17

lines 33 – 37);

when the pre-archiving agent is finished archiving the selected document

(Column 17 lines 33 – 37);

involving a post-archiving agent, if any, on the archived document (Column 17

lines 33 – 41 and Column 18 lines 24 – 30), Ferguson teaches that the file helper utility

continues to make an index of each archived document (acting as a post-archiving

agent); and

when the post-archiving agent is finished, marking archived document as

'archived' (Column 17 lines 30 – 37), Ferguson teaches that a thumbnail representation

('marking archived') of each archived document.

6.   Regarding Claim 7, Ferguson teaches and describes in a computing

environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document

processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B,

Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18

line 35), said system comprising:

means for providing customized code for execution during the off-loading

process (Column 3 lines 47 – 59, Column 17 lines 12 – 20 and 59 – 67); and

means for invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued

relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-

loading process (Column 3 line 60 – Column 4 line 35).

7.   Claim 2 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson

teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents

being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by

an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and

Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code is invoked

synchronously to process the document before the document has been off-loaded from

the document processing system (Column 17 lines 25 – 33).

8.   Claim 3 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson

teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents

being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by

an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and

Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code is invoked

synchronously to process the document after the document has been off-loaded from

the document processing system (Column 17 lines 25 – 45).

9.   Claim 4 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson

teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents

being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by

an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and

Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code forms an agent,

the agent being invoked via a plug-in interface to the document processing system

(Column 3 lines 30 – 55).

10.   Claim 5 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson

teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents

being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by

an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and

Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code runs inside a

plug-in architecture (Column 3 lines 30 – 55).

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-

272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday – Thursday 8:00a.m. To

3:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy
February 18, 2005.

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEF
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100